REMARKS

I. Introduction

In view of the above amendments and the following remarks, reconsideration of the rejections contained in the Office Action of February 24, 2009 is respectfully requested.

By this amendment claims 1, 3, 5, 24, 25, and 36-38 have been amended and claims 39 and 40 have been added. Because the election/restriction requirement of July 11, 2008 indicates that claim 1 is generic to the distinct species of claims 24 and 25, and because claim 24 was elected in the Response of July 29, 2008, claim 25 is withdrawn but currently amended. Claims 1-11, 24-25, and 36-40 are now pending in the application. No new matter has been added by these amendments.

II. 35 U.S.C. § 112

On page 2 of the Office Action, claims 1-11, 24, and 36-38 are rejected as being indefinite for failing to adequately define the parameters of the variable "n." Applicants submit that the fact that "n" is not limited to being "fractional, very large, very small, etc." is a matter of claim *breadth*, not indefiniteness.

Nevertheless, while Applicants do not agree with the propriety of this rejection, the claims have been amended such that they no longer include the variable "n." Withdrawal of this rejection is respectfully requested.

III. Prior Art Rejections

Currently, claims 1-11 and 36-38 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) as being unpatentable over Sulzbach (US 5,834,527) and claim 24 stands rejected under 35 U.S.C. §

103(a) as being unpatentable over Kaminski et al. (US 5,283,924) in view of Sulzbach.

Claims 1 and 24 are patentable over Sulzbach and Kaminski et al. for the following reasons. Claims 1 and 24 each require a foam molding method for foaming a foamable material, comprising providing a mold having a cavity, the cavity having a cavity volume, injecting the foamable material into the cavity of the mold, controlling an injection flow rate of the foamable material injected into the cavity of the mold, pressurizing the cavity of the mold to a pressurization, foaming the foamable material in the cavity of the mold under the pressurization to control foaming of the foamable material; and releasing the pressurization of the cavity of the mold, wherein the cavity of the mold is at atmospheric pressure when injection of the foamable material into the cavity of the mold is started.

Sulzbach discloses a process for manufacturing polyurethane foam moldings wherein the cavity of the mold is pressurized *before* injecting the reactive mixture. (Column 3, lines 39-51 of Sulzbach; see also claim 1 of Sulzbach.) Specifically, Sulzbach discloses a gas pressure of 6 bar being produced in the mold cavity via a gas supply line (column 3, lines 39-40), and discloses that the gas pressure is reduced after the mold cavity is filled to a certain percentage and supply of the reactive mixture has stopped (column 3, lines 45-52). Because Sulzbach does not disclose a foam molding method wherein the cavity of the mold is at atmospheric pressure when the injection of the foamable material is started, Sulzbach cannot meet the requirements of claims 1 and 24.

Further, the process of Sulzbach involves filling the mold to a certain capacity (column 3, line 46, "the mold cavity 1 has been ca. 11% filled"); but Sulzbach makes no disclosure of controlling the *flow rate* of the injection of the foamable material. Because Sulzbach does not disclose a foam molding method which includes controlling an injection flow rate of the

foamable material, Sulzbach cannot meet the requirements of claims 1 and 24.

The Kaminski et al. reference is cited for teaching a brush in which polymeric foam is disposed around a solid core. However, the Kaminski et al. reference fails to cure the above-discussed deficiencies of Sulzbach; as such, Kaminski et al. cannot meet the requirements of claims 1 and 24.

It is thus submitted that the invention of the present application, as defined in claims 1 and 24, is not anticipated nor rendered obvious by the prior art, and yields significant advantages over the prior art. Allowance is respectfully requested.

Claims 2-11 and 36-40 depend, directly or indirectly, from claim 1 and are thus allowable for at least the reasons set forth above in support of claim 1.

In view of the foregoing amendments and remarks, inasmuch as all of the outstanding issues have been addressed, Applicants respectfully submit that the present application is now in condition for allowance, and action to such effect is earnestly solicited.

Should any issues remain after consideration of the response, however, the Examiner is invited to telephone the undersigned at the Examiner's convenience. If any fee beyond that submitted herewith, or extension of time is required to obtain entry of this Amendment, the undersigned hereby petitions the Commissioner to grant any necessary time extension and authorizes charging Deposit Account 23-0975 for any such fee not submitted herewith.

Respectfully submitted,
Satoshi TANAKA et al.

/Andrew D. St.Clair/
2009.05.26 14:01:30 -04'00'

By:_____
Andrew D. St.Clair
Registration No. 58,739
Attorney for Applicants

ADS/CRW/rgf
Washington, D.C. 20005-1503
Telephone (202) 721-8200
Facsimile (202) 721-8250
May 26, 2009